

**Yee &
Associates, P.C.**

4100 Alpha Road
Suite 1100
Dallas, Texas 75244

Main No. (972) 385-8777
Facsimile (972) 385-7766

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 22 2005

Facsimile Cover Sheet

To: Commissioner for Patents for Examiner: David E. England Group Art Unit: 2143	Facsimile No.: 703/872-9306
From: Monica Gamez for Amelia Turner Legal Assistant to Stephen R. Tkacs	No. of Pages Including Cover Sheet: <u>6</u>
Message: Enclosed herewith: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transmittal Document; and• Reply Brief.	
Re: Application No. 09/578,107 Attorney Docket No: JP9-1999-0099-US1	
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2005	
Please contact us at (972) 385-8777 if you do not receive all pages indicated above or experience any difficulty in receiving this facsimile.	<i>This Facsimile is intended only for the use of the addressee and, if the addressee is a client or their agent, contains privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this facsimile, you have received this facsimile inadvertently and in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone and return the facsimile to us immediately.</i>

**PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS TRANSMISSION BY
FAXING A CONFIRMATION TO (972) 385-7766.**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Kawase et al.**Serial No.: **09/578,107**Filed: **May 24, 2000****For: Method and System for Changing
a Collaborating Client Behavior
According to Context****36736**PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER§
§
§
§
§
§Group Art Unit: **2143**Examiner: **England, David E.**Attorney Docket No.: **JP9-1999-0099-US1**Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number (703) 872-9306 on February 22, 2005.

By:


Monica GamezTRANSMITTAL DOCUMENTCommissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

ENCLOSED HERewith:

- Reply Brief (37 C.F.R. 41.41).

No fees are believed to be required. If, however, any fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0461. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,


Stephen R. Tkacs

Registration No. 46,430

AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

Duke W. Yce

Registration No. 34,285

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

P.O. Box 802333

Dallas, Texas 75380

(972) 385-8777

Docket No. JP9-1999-0099-US1

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 22 2005**

In re application of: Kawase et al.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 2143

Serial No.: 09/578,107

Examiner: England, David E.

Filed: May 24, 2000

For: Method and System for Changing
a Collaborating Client Behavior
According to Context

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number (703) 872-9306 on February 22, 2005.

By:

Monica Gamez

REPLY BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 41.41)

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on December 22, 2004.

No fees are believed to be required to file a Reply Brief. Any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefore, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF REPLY BRIEF.

(Reply Brief Page 1 of 4)
Kawase et al. - 09/578,107

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT

In the Appeal Brief filed September 1, 2004, Appellants argued that *Jawahar* does not teach or suggest editing contents of the HTTP message when the HTTP message agrees with a predetermined condition and sending the HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser, as recited in claim 1. In response, the Examiner's Answer theorizes that the term "edit" can be interpreted to include adding other content to the HTTP message. The Examiner's Answer then comes to the conclusion that presenting the unedited HTTP message in a frame of an agent's browser application, as shown in Figure 6 of *Jawahar*, is equivalent to editing the message. Appellants respectfully disagree. Clearly, one may say that, upon presenting the HTTP message in a frame of the browser, the agent side browser becomes edited; however, the HTTP message is not itself edited. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the HTTP message may be considered to be edited by presenting it in a frame, the editing would take place at the agent side terminal; therefore, *Jawahar* does not teach or suggest sending the HTTP message in an **edited form** to the agent-side browser. It is clear from the teachings of *Jawahar* that the HTTP message is sent to the agent-side browser in **unedited** form and then presented in a frame at the agent-side browser.

Appellants also acknowledged that the cited portions of *Jawahar* do indeed teach a "synchronization service" and a "POST method." However, the Examiner's Answer proffers no analysis as to why this is somehow equivalent to carrying out editing to **insert a command for a client program loaded on the agent-side information terminal**, as recited in claims 2, 11, and 15. The Examiner's Answer argues the same portions that, again, teach a synchronization service. The relevance of these portions is still unclear, because the cited portions make no mention of a client program being loaded on the agent-side information terminal and, as stated above, *Jawahar* simply does not teach editing the HTTP message before sending the message to the agent-side browser. At best, *Jawahar* teaches a synchronization service that allows changes to be transmitted from a customer client to an agent. However, this is not equivalent to receiving an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request,

as recited in claim 1. Rather, changes are posted from the customer client and not received from a Web server.

Appellants further acknowledged that the cited portion does teach that the customer-client of *Jawahar* may communicate additional information that is **not** a URL to the server. The Examiner's Answer argues that *Jawahar* teaches, "if a customer request includes information that is not or should not be readily available to the agent." However, the Examiner's Answer is still unclear as to how this is somehow equivalent to carrying out editing to insert a command for a client program loaded on the agent-side information terminal where the command is one of "form submit prohibition," "form alteration prohibition," "concealment of specific form," or "concealment of specific field," as recited in claims 3, 12, and 16. In fact, in such cases, i.e., if a customer request includes information that is not or should not be readily available to the agent, the agent computer accesses a cached web page, rather than a dynamically created version, to ensure that an unedited version is sent to the agent. See *Jawahar*, col. 19, lines 11-50. The cited portions make no mention of a client program being loaded on the agent-side information terminal. Thus, it follows that *Jawahar* does not teach the further limitations in claims 3, 12, and 16. The applied reference fails to teach each and every claim limitation; therefore, *Jawahar* does not anticipate claims 3, 12, and 16.

Appellants further argued that the *Jawahar* reference actually teaches away from the presently claimed invention because it teaches that the customer and the agent view the **same** Web page with the **same** information, as opposed to sending an HTTP message to the customer in an **unedited** form and sending the HTTP message to the agent in an **edited** form, as in the presently claimed invention. The Examiner's Answer again alleges that presenting the HTTP message in a frame at the agent-side terminal is somehow equivalent to editing the HTTP message and then sending the HTTP message in edited form. Appellants respectfully disagree. *Jawahar* clearly teaches sending the HTTP message in **unedited form** and then presenting the unedited HTTP message in a frame. Any editing that may take place in *Jawahar*, if one were to interpret presentation of a message in a frame as editing, takes place **after** the message is sent to the agent browser.

In fact, the portion of *Jawahar* cited in the Examiner's Answer as teaching a synchronization service further supports the position of the Appellants, because the synchronization service ensures that the agent sees the exact same Web page as the customer, even when the customer makes changes. In other words, *Jawahar* teaches that the agent sees an unedited version of the Web page and that any changes made after the Web page is sent to the agent are communicated to the agent. Therefore, if the customer starts to enter a bank account number in a form, the agent sees this information in the agent side browser. This is contrary to the present invention, which edits an HTTP message before sending the message to the agent, thus allowing the customer to hide such sensitive information.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-3, 10-12, and 14-16 is overcome. Accordingly, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 1-3, 10-12, and 14-16 not be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen R. Tkacs
Registration No. 46,430
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS